

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of TYNITTA RAINER, DEXTER  
BLAYLOCK, and LATONYA BLAYLOCK,  
Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
May 8, 1998

v

No. 205157  
Wayne Juvenile Court  
LC No. 94-322805

VENITA DIANE BLAYLOCK,  
  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

HERBERT TYRONE RAINER, ELIJAH  
ARMSTEAD, and EUGENE OTIS KNOX,  
  
Respondents.

---

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Jansen and Gage, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant Venita Blaylock (hereafter respondent) appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 471-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). The conditions that caused the court to assume jurisdiction in this case continued to exist at the time of the termination hearing in that respondent failed to seek substance abuse treatment as ordered by the court.

Furthermore, respondent failed to provide proper care for the children in the past due to her substance abuse problem. Because she failed to complete treatment and was not motivated to seek treatment, there was no reasonable expectation that she would be able to provide proper care and custody for the children within a reasonable amount of time. While respondent made more recent progress toward the goal of completing substance abuse treatment, the little progress made in meeting this goal did not justify the juvenile court continuing to keep the children in foster care.

Respondent also argues that termination of her parental rights was not in the children's best interests. We disagree. Respondent failed to produce evidence to show that termination of her rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. The juvenile court was therefore required to terminate respondent's parental rights. *In re Hall-Smith, supra* at 472-473. The evidence from petitioner, including the recommendation of the children's therapist, was that termination of respondent's rights was in the children's best interests. Thus, the juvenile court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights. *In re Hamlet (After Remand)*, 225 Mich App 505, 515; 571 NW2d 750 (1997).

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ Kathleen Jansen  
/s/ Hilda R. Gage